Note on "Equivalence Between Different Auxiliary Field Formulations of $\mathcal{N}=1$ Supergravity Coupled to Matter"

Shuntaro Aoki[1*] and Yusuke Yamada[2†]

[1] *Department of Physics, Waseda university, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan*

[2] *Stanford Institute for Theoretical Physics and Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, U.S.A.*

arXiv:1609.01004v2 [hep-th] 8 Nov 2016

In Ref. [1], we claimed that the off-shell supergravity(SUGRA) formulations with different auxiliary fields can be unified with U(1) gauge symmetry, whose gauge superfield does not have a kinetic term. However, after the submission, we found a critical error in our statement.

As shown in Sec. 3.2 of Ref. [1], we can formally introduce gauged R-symmetry (without gauge kinetic function) into the a general old-minimal SUGRA action as Eq. (40). This action can be dual to the new-minimal SUGRA, and indeed we can formally introduce a linear superfield by the procedure shown in Ref. [2]. However, the dual action of that in Eq. (40) generically has V_R only in a term $[g_R L_0 V_R]_D$, where L_0 is a real linear compensator, which is shown in Appendix. Since V_R is linear in this term, its equation of motion leads to $L_0 = 0$, which shows that we cannot identify L_0 as a compensator field. For example, in Eq. (51), we actually find that V_R has only a term $[g_R V_R L_0]$, and obtain $L_0 = 0$ by the equation of motion of V_R. This leads to the original action (41). Therefore, the old minimal SUGRA action (40) cannot be embedded into the new-minimal SUGRA formulation.

We would like to thank the anonymous referee for pointing out this critical error in our statement.

A proof

Let us consider a general old-minimal SUGRA action with $\mathrm{U}(1)_R$ but without a kinetic term of the $\mathrm{U}(1)_R$ vector superfield,

$$S = \left[\frac{1}{2}\tilde{S}_0\overline{\tilde{S}}_0 e^{-g_R V_R}\Omega(\tilde{S}^i, \overline{\tilde{S}}^{\bar{j}} e^{-g_R m_j V_R}, \Phi, \overline{\Phi})\right]_D + [\tilde{S}_0^3 \tilde{W}(\tilde{S}^i, \Phi)]_F, \tag{A.1}$$

where $\tilde{S}_0$, $\tilde{S}^i$, and Φ denote a compensator, matter, Stuckelberg chiral superfield, respectively, and they are transformed under $\mathrm{U}(1)_R$ as,

$$\tilde{S}_0 \to \tilde{S}_0 e^{i\Lambda}, \tag{A.2}$$

$$\tilde{S}^i \to \tilde{S}^i e^{i m_i \Lambda}, \tag{A.3}$$

$$\Phi \to \Phi + i\Lambda, \tag{A.4}$$

where Λ is a chiral superfield. By the following field redefinitions, we make the compensator and matter as singlet under $\mathrm{U}(1)_R$,

$$S_0 \equiv \tilde{S}_0 e^{-\Phi}, \quad S^i \equiv \tilde{S}^i e^{-m_i \Phi}.$$

*E-mail address: shun-soccer@akane.waseda.jp

†E-mail address: yusukeyy@stanford.edu

Then, the action (A.1) becomes

$$S = \left[\frac{1}{2}S_0\overline{S}_0\Omega(S^i, \overline{S}^{\bar{j}}e^{-g_R m_j V_R}, \Phi + \overline{\Phi} + g_R V_R)\right]_D + [S_0^3 W(S^i)]_F. \tag{A.5}$$

Note that, due to the $\mathrm{U}(1)_R$ gauge invariance, $\mathrm{U}(1)_R$ vector superfield only appear in the combination $\Phi + \overline{\Phi} + g_R V_R$. Using a Lagrange multiplier U, we can rewrite this action as

$$S = \left[\frac{1}{2}S_0\overline{S}_0\Omega(S^i, \overline{S}^{\bar{j}}, U)\right]_D + [S_0^3 W(S^i)]_F + [L_0(U - g_R V_R)]_D, \tag{A.6}$$

where U is a real general superfield, and L_0 is a real linear superfield. The variation of L_0 gives

$$U = \Phi + \overline{\Phi} + g_R V_R, \tag{A.7}$$

which reproduces the previous action. Instead, the variation of U gives

$$L_0 + \frac{1}{2}S_0\overline{S}_0\partial_U\Omega = 0, \tag{A.8}$$

which, in principle, is solved with respect to U and yields $U = U(S_0, \overline{S}_0, S^i, \overline{S}^{\bar{j}}, L_0)$. Note that U does not depend on V_R. Then, substituting $U = U(S_0, \overline{S}_0, S^i, \overline{S}^{\bar{j}}, L_0)$, we obtain

$$S = [\mathcal{F}(S_0, \overline{S}_0, S^i, \overline{S}^{\bar{j}}, L_0)]_D + [S_0^3 W(S^i)]_F + [-g_R V_R L_0]_D, \tag{A.9}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}(S_0, \overline{S}_0, S^i, \overline{S}^{\bar{j}}, L_0) \equiv \left(\frac{1}{2}S_0\overline{S}_0\Omega(S^i, \overline{S}^{\bar{j}}, U) + L_0 U\right)|_{U=U(S_0,\overline{S}_0,S^i,\overline{S}^{\bar{j}},L_0)}. \tag{A.10}$$

The action has V_R only in the last term, which leads to $L_0 = 0$. Thus, we find that the gauged R old-minimal action (A.1) cannot be the new-minimal SUGRA action. Note that this conclusion comes from the assumption that V_R does not have a kinetic term, and if there exists such a term, we do not obtain $L_0 = 0$.

References

[1] S. Aoki and Y. Yamada, "Equivalence Between Different Auxiliary Field Formulations of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Supergravity Coupled to Matter," arXiv:1609.01004 v1[hep-th].

[2] S. Ferrara, L. Girardello, T. Kugo and A. Van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. B **223**, 191 (1983).